

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANGEL FLORES,

Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT,

Respondent.

No. C 15-3874 JSW (PR)

**ORDER**


This case was opened on August 25, 2015, when Petitioner, a California prisoner, filed a notice that he had exhausted claims in the California Supreme Court. Petitioner was notified that same day that in order to proceed with his claims he would need to file a habeas petition. He was provided the relevant forms, instructions, and a stamped return envelope, and informed that the case would be dismissed if he did not file a petition within 28 days. After nearly three months, he had not filed a habeas petition, and the case was accordingly dismissed without prejudice on November 23, 2015.

The Court has since received correspondence from Petitioner explaining his efforts to complete an in forma pauperis (“IFP”) application. Petitioner paid the filing fee, however, which made an IFP application unnecessary. It is clear from his correspondence, however, that Petitioner wishes to pursue a habeas petition. To do so, he file a habeas petition with the Court in a new case, preferably using the Court’s form for habeas petitions. The instant case is closed and he may no longer pursue his claims

1 or file a habeas petition in this case. The Clerk shall mail Petitioner a copy of the  
2 Court's form habeas petition along with this order.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: January 28, 2016

5   
6 JEFFREY S. WHITE  
7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28